**OVERFLOW MEETING**

**MINUTES**

***October 15, 2009, 3:00p.m. -5:00 p.m.***

# ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ROLL CALL**

Present:

John Bardo, Richard Beam, Wayne Billon, Heidi Buchanan, David Claxton , Beverly Collins, Chris Cooper, Jane Eastman, John Hodges, David Hudson, Rebecca Lasher, Ron Mau, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Jane Perlmutter, Phillip Sanger, Barbara St. John, Jack Summers, Michael Thomas, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Laura Wright

Members with Proxies:

Mary Kay Bauer, Jamie Davis, Terre Folger, Steven Ha, Eleanor Hilty, Christopher Hoyt, Frank Lockwood, Sean O’Connell, Chuck Tucker,

Members absent:

Kyle Carter, Jack Sholder

Recorder:

Ann Green

**EXTERNAL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Faculty Assembly/David Claxton and Beverly Collins:

Richard Bean: I apologize for being absent at the last regular meeting. As I think Sean told you, I was at Faculty Assembly along with Dr. Claxton and Beverly Collins. And, so it’s appropriate since we were unable to give a report last time since the meeting hadn’t happened yet to spend a couple of minutes and have Dr. Claxton to tell us what happened down there.

David Claxton: The meeting started with a presentation by President Erskine Bowles who addressed the rough economic times the University has been facing. They had been anticipating these budget problems and so the university had taken measures to, in his words, the academic court. Across the NC system, 23% of the dollars cut are from the administrative side of the budget and 5% from the academic side. He gave some information to us that showed how the campuses had done this and at Western we were pretty close to average with 22% of our budgets coming from the administration and 5.6% in academics. President Bowles commented that he is still committed to his UNC Tomorrow Plan. He said he will not change his number one priority; he’s been encouraged to do so, but he’s not going to do it and that is to improve public K-12 education. He intends to develop a method for determining where school teachers and principals earn their degrees and then comparing that data to the student’s test results and then see which of these schools is doing the best job preparing teachers and principals. Other UNC Tomorrow focus areas are increasing access to higher education, looking at greater reliance on community colleges and expansion of distance education. Transforming our institutions to be more nimble, efficient, and responsive and here they are focused on changing the focus from university enrollment to retention and graduation. He also talked about increasing focus research and becoming more actively engaged in economic transformation. To this part he mentioned that the university as a whole had received a billion dollars for research through stimulus funding. So, I hope some of that comes to Western and to increase global competitiveness. Toward this end, he talked about having higher admission standards at all the universities, higher standards for overall performance and upgrading the talent of administrators, faculty and employees. We also heard from Rob Nelson, who is Vice President for Finance. He talked about last year’s budget cuts and mentioned that we ended up with a 10% reduction overall across the system. He also talked about the furlough and mentioned that was an action taken by the Governor. It used the Governor’s power and authority to meet the NC Constitution that requires the state have a balanced budget. If you’re worried about how the furlough happened that’s how that happened. Laura Bernstein Luger is Vice President for Legal Issues and General Counsel. She talked about how funds and contracts and tenure were handled in light of the financial problem. Alan Mabe is the Senior Vice President. He discussed with us, faculty work load issues, mentioning that the focus is moving away from the number of classes that each faculty member teaches and is going to focus on the number of student credit hours that each faculty member generates. Research into the student credit hour generation on 14 of the 16 campuses of the UNC system show that we are above the Carnegie average. He also reported that there is a new process for examining new program proposals. He gave us a website that I’ll be emailing to Erin so you’ll have that website and you can now get on that website and find out what programs are being proposed across the University. And, he stated that each program and I interpreted that to be if we have a program similar to that, that we may provide a faculty member to be a member of the panel that will review new proposals. I got on that website and it was interesting to see what is planned at different Universities across the system. He said will be examining what he called the problem of non tenure track faculty at campuses across the system. Then at that point, the representatives were assigned to committees and the committees were given their jobs for the year. And briefly, I’ll tell you what focuses for those committees are going to be. Beverly is on the Research Committee. I’m on the Governance and Faculty Development/Welfare/Benefits Committee and Richard is on the Academic Core Committee. Academic Core is going to define the academic core and then track and monitor the effects of budget cuts on the academic core. The Distance Education and Technology Committee they will define the next generation of issues regarding distance education. They’re going to look at quality control for distance education and they’re going to look at President Bowle’s plan for hiring a full time lead person for distance education at GA. Right now there’s not one. My committee of Governance and Faculty Development/Welfare/Benefits Committee is going to focus on effective shared governance. We going to work with the historically minority institutions that are moving in that direction; some more slowly than others, and the committee’s also interested in providing training for faculty governance roles for universities that need that help. We also looked into the health care issue that I think some of you are familiar with about obesity and tobacco use. So, we’re also going to come up with a resolution about that. The Communication and Advocacy Committee are working on developing communication plans so that Faculty Assembly can better get stuff out to key audiences and they are also providing a liaison to work with the UNC Staff Assembly. The Academic and Freedom Committee is studying the faculty mix on campus of tenured and tenure track and adjunct faculty and they are also going to monitor Comment: The billion dollars was actually campus based campus initiated grant proposals.

We have not been successful in getting any unclear….

Report from Chancellor John Bardo:

We did announce our Campaign total and the campaign raised $51,826,950 dollars. We had set out originally to try to raise $20 million and we’re told we probably couldn’t do it in the next five years. Clifton Metcalf called me about six months into it and said, John, we have $20 million and now what? And, I said, let’s raise it and he said okay, $5 more million, I don’t think we can get more than that. Then, he called me back and said we got that, we got that and finally we got to $30 million and I said, Clifton, let’s not nickel and dime this, let’s go to $40 and that was our final target, $40 million, and we actually raised $51 almost $52. The nature of this, 26% of it is already out and about in the university in various forms of scholarships, endowed professorships, etc. There is also a substantial amount that is coming in, in ongoing pledges and the way these campaigns work is when you announce a total people on campus go now, wait a minute where’s the money? A lot of what you are getting are irrevocable trusts, wills etc. and can count so that a person 35 years old and give you their life estate and some Chancellor and some faculty will see it in terms of reality. But you know that you’ve got it, you know it’s there and then you can also work with that person to make sure that they don’t change their mind. -Those kinds of things. But, this has been a much more successful campaign than we initially thought was feasible and I will tell you that Erskine, when I told him that we did it, he said you may have been the only person in NC that thought Western Carolina could raise $40 million. And, I said no, Clifton Metcalf also thought we could raise $40 million. We don’t think this is over. We had to declare victory on the campaign, but we do believe that what is happening here; we’re getting potential donors coming to the door, now every week and that’s very unusual for where we’ve been. It’s a different situation, but it’s because they’re seeing the work that’s going on and they’re hearing about what’s happening. So, I’m excited and it’s pleasing to see that. But that’s just so you all know that is the total.

I have a couple other items.

One is I appreciate everyone understanding, I did want to back off on some of the things that I had suggested we work on this year, just given the choppiness of the year. And the importance of the Quality Enhancement Plan to keep on. I want to say also, I know that before you is a resolution regarding general education. It was not the right time for a Chancellor initiated review of general education to occur. If it is a faculty initiated general education review; faculty believe it is in the best interests of the university to do so, I will support it. I will help put funding behind it; etc. If you do believe that it is the right time to do it, I will understand that. So, I am not asking you to do anything with this resolution. What I’m telling you is that I do believe this should be at the will of faculty and you tell me what you want to do and I’ll back you, which is where I think we need to be on this. We are seeing continuing tremendous interest in our entering class of 2010. If anything it is more interest than we had last year. We anticipate, I am allowed to say, according to the people who control the numbers, that they think we’ll have 14,500 applicants. I actually think a little more than that; they’re being conservative. But, what we’re seeing is that more of these kids are completing applications now. More of them are ready to be admitted now than we’ve ever seen before and so it is going to be important; if you’ll take back to your constituents that we will need their help. And these are bright kids, these are good solid kids. I heard at the steering committee about some of the changes that people are experiencing and I will tell you that I heard both from some members of the Senate and from others, complaints about their seniors. Because their seniors are not as good as their freshmen. We’ve been waiting a long time to hear that. And I’m really pleased that that is actually happening. A lot of it is not just SAT and GPA, but a lot of it is selection on attitude and that by the QEP being so clear and allowing us to lay out very clearly to potential students who we are, what we stand for, what their education will be like, we’re getting a different kid and that isn’t always reflected in SATs and GPAs and you may feel some of that. They just are different. Chip Smith told me that he was at a soccer match a week or so ago and sat down next to a kid who was a fifth year senior and he said, we’ll how is your year going? And the kid said not all that well, most of my friends are gone and these new students just don’t like to party like the old ones. What a wonderful testament. That’s exactly where we’ve been trying to get. Our retention rate until we actually officially announce it, we don’t know exactly what it’s going to be, but we think it’s 75.9%. That puts us way up from where we’ve been. Three or four years ago we were running at 67%. Alan Mabe has a number he says is the national average for schools like us. We get a different number when we look at the data than the one he has. However, I will accept his number; we’re above it in terms of what is typical for our kind of school. If you look at the number that both Kyle and I think is the real number, we are way above it. We think the average is right below 70% which (unclear) told you right before I came here. The 75% they use at GA, I was not familiar with. It might be the right number, but it is nice to be on that end. And so many people make that possible. It’s what we do in the classrooms, what we do in the residence halls, people who are advising, how we engage them in recreation, how we think about who they are and it is making a difference I just wanted you to be aware. From my end of this world it’s very gratifying to see that happening. And, I think if the economy had been better our retention rate would have been higher. There were several hundred undergraduates who simply couldn’t come back because of family losing jobs and needing to go home to help. We know that number was about several hundred higher than we normally see in the transition years. That’s where we are folks, and I’d be happy to answer any questions or address any topic you would like.

Thank you all very much and thank you for all your hard work on the Senate and this is a day to celebrate and I will say off the record is that the reason we wanted to get over $50 (million) is Appalachian because when Clifton ran their campaign it got $50 (million).

Brenda Holcombe from Staff Senate had asked that I remind people about the food drive that the Staff Senate had put together. They are collecting up through November 6th and I sent out an email. There are four names of the Staff Senate, Brenda Holcombe, Donna Welch, Laura Simmons and Eric Margiotta. You can drop off food at their locations and there are going to be student groups that are going to help also. I encourage, because these go to local people. The knapsack programs are so that kids go home with food on weekends.

Section 4.0 of the Constitution

In the agenda, that Erin graciously pulled together for us the next item would be an update on the Resolution that was passed regarding adherence to the Section 4.0 of the Constitution. Erin, I believe you said we heard from five of the colleges plus the library? “Correct. So all but one.” We’ve had a response at least from all but one of the units affected. They differ. Erin has copied me on most of this, and I’ve looked at them, although I didn’t print them out. And, I realized as this started coming in that in my initial drafting of the resolution, that you passed not long ago, I may not have made a couple of things as clear as I thought I had. I think at least two of the units for example; response suggests that because their documents we requested appear on their shared drive, that that constitutes compliance. My sense and the fact that they included the information that the committees mandated by the constitution exist; that it also consists of/amounts to compliance. And, I can see how that is interpretable under the specific wording that I had that I do not believe was amended. My intent in drafting this and I wish I had been here to explain this because we might have wanted to amend it, was that the Constitution is a public document; they’re subject to public meeting laws, etc. Our Faculty Constitution as a derivative document of actions of the Board of Governors and so on; it is a public document. It is out there on the website. We can all look at it. It doesn’t matter what unit we are in. The general public has access to it if they so desire. My belief and intent was that these documents as derivative documents mandated by that documents are therefore also public documents. Which is why I specifically suggested that it be on the website, but I think the wording may have tripped me up and I can understand that. Down towards the bottom of the Resolution was a reference to the idea that current By-laws along with current listing of committees of their unit placed on the unit’s webpage and be continuously accessible to the faculty of the unit. That probably should have been stated to the faculty or to the public. But, it wasn’t. So, I guess what may need to be done is to try to clarify this if it is the will of the Senate that the intent that these documents, not just the existence of the committees, but the membership as well as the By-laws be considered public documents and be posted directly on the website so that it is available to the public at large. I certainly have no reservations about the idea of the shared drive being used for working documents within a given unit. What a given unit wants to do with their work I think is reasonably appropriate. That it be kept within the unit until it is finalized and is ready for publication. It does seem to me that once these documents are finalized, they should be available. If for no other reason, than someone in the College of Arts & Sciences might want to know how something is done in the College of Business and vice versa and so on. Or potential faculty members, who are being recruited, might have some interest in seeing how governance is handled on our campus. Not only at the general level of the general faculty, but in terms of the specific units that they might be part of. That was a large part of my rationale in drafting this and I await the pleasure of the Senate as to how to proceed.

Comment: So, what are you proposing, a clarification motion that would pass?

Motion made and seconded.

Discussion?

None.

Voice Vote passed.

Richard Beam: I will draft a memo of clarification and submit it to all of the appropriate Deans and a copy to the Provost Office so that this is clear.

Liberal Studies/General Studies Resolution

Alright, I believe the major agenda item on the floor today was to deal with I gather was unresolved discussion around a Resolution submitted by David McCord in relation to Liberal Studies/General Studies. I understand there are some amendments from the floor to the original resolution that was proposed. And, I think you all have seen that there is in essence a further revision that is sort of a substitute resolution that David drafted.

Comment: Does anybody need Version 3, David’s version that went around?

It’s the one that had multiple edits on it.

Comment: A single word in David’s resolution, it looks like the second sentence in the first paragraph, talks about the way faculty can ensure every student has the attitudes of an educated person. I’m not sure I’m happy with saying that educated people have a uniform attitude.

Comment: I cut and pasted that probably from the Liberal Studies document itself and have not revisited that. Probably a lot of words in that section came from that. It’s the preamble to current Liberal Studies program. I didn’t make it up.

Comment: Is there a reason that we should say that educated people have an attitude.

Comment: It doesn’t say that it’s one attitude; it’s a plural.

Comment: Part of what a general studies program is trying , I think, to achieve is a set of knowledge, values, beliefs and attitudes for quality of living…I do think that’s been vetted. The goals of the committee came with categories for instance, and probably the categories that we might come up with for the future.

Global perspectives I would say, includes thinking that would go under the roof of attitudes.

I’m fine with, I’m not unclear….I would defend attitudes as being included with what we try to deal with in Liberal Studies courses.

Comment: I have one problem that goes to the heart of the proposal and that’s the 9th or 10th word, which is the word, single.

Comment: That is the intent. I didn’t cut and paste that.

Comment: I understand that, but I remain unconvinced after talking to my colleagues and many people that single really doesn’t fit the needs of general education for every student. I can very well see for general education that are aspects and I went back to look at all the courses that are offered in the general education thing to make sure I wasn’t missing something. But, I find it very, I just don’t see that there is a rationale that one single general education program fits everything. I think that general education for a nurse might be quite different for a person in business or accounting or engine3ring or some of the other professions. And, so by saying this, you’re saying, no, one size fits all. Even though, I know there’s variability; I just don’t buy it.

Comment: I respect your opinion, x, I disagree with it fundamentally. I think that when we talk about a general studies program for a college or university that it’s something that is shared regardless of the major or program that you’re in. It represents the consensus that as difficult to achieve of all 500 faculty represented by their elected Senate. If we all agree with it no matter what you have majored in; what your degree is. A Bachelors degree from Western Carolina University at least implies this foundation. And that we all back that up and it reflects all of us regardless of your major. If we start doing what Brian did or what you are talking about; if nurses have their own, engineers have their own and honors have their own and music students have their own, then we have no ability as a faculty as a whole to have any say so as to what those students end up with as to general education. We lose a grip on what is a core aspect of the college/university. So, I fundamentally disagree with you. The word, single, is a point of this Resolution.

Comment: It is and I fundamentally disagree with yours. I’ve seen too much. I just don’t see it – that single. That second sentence that describes what you want in a student what distinguishing characteristics; critical thinking, all those aspects are, everyone I’ve talked to believe it and more. We would add self directed learners in that context as well; although it’s not stated there, but that’s the kind of, I would say an attitude, or characteristic of the student that graduates from Western Carolina University. One set doesn’t necessarily say is required to meet that statement.

Comment: There is choice; he sort of said it almost as a footnote. There is a set, but there is a choice set within the set, right? All we’re saying here are these basic, unifying principles within those you can choose your own adventure. I mean how many options, how many different combinations there are; there may be possibly thousands of possible programs that a student could choose and still graduate with a general education. There is a lot of choice here.

Comment: Yes, but I would suggest in the 5 or 6 categories; you’ve got 6 hours here, 9 hours there that could fundamentally change if you’re a nurse vs. an engineer.

Comment: That’s what I’m trying to avoid.

Comment: But, I think it’s inappropriate. Because those professions in life they need to be prepared in a different context than say a musician would be and I think…

Comment: But, that’s what a major is for.

Comment: The general education is in the context.

Comment: You can have about 80 of that to do what you want to do. We’re just saying that as a faculty as a whole we want something in the 30-40 neighborhood to provide a liberal foundation education that’s characteristic of every student that’s here that we monitor as a single, unified faculty through the Senate.

Comment: So, are we in fact talking about the Liberal Studies, because there’s this business of 1/3 Liberal Studies, 1/3 being General Elective and 1/3 being in the major.

Comment: Where do you see that?

Comment: Well, I’ve heard that from the Chancellor.

Comment: Right, I didn’t put that in here. I tried to genericize this as much as possible. General studies because you may do different things. You’re not going to get below 30 I don’t think, but I think we have a lot of freedom I tried to take Liberal Studies out. I may have missed something, but I tried to make it General Studies. I think having an oversight committee is absolutely essential that meets all the time and reports to this group. I just called it the Oversight Committee rather than the Liberal Studies Oversight Committee. I tried to get out from under any specific so this would last as a concept. The concept, XX is disagreeing with (unclear).

Comment: Well, see I would just like to have it clear that we’re talking about the 30-40 hours and not the 1/3 and 1/3, 1/3 concept.

Comment: You can do that in your Resolution, x.

Comment: Alright.

Comment: I hesitate to wade in on this issue because my feelings, my personal opinions have been adequately expressed for those of you that were at the opening meeting. I don’t see anything in this wording, at least as I read it that would prohibit any individual program from having program requirements in addition to a single core of general studies, general education; whatever you want to call it that would be university wide. I certainly think that’s an idea that’s worth exploring. They already exist. There are at least particularly, B.A. degrees at the moment that require a foreign language at a level that’s not required by general education; its required by colleges for specific degree programs and there may be other requirements like that that I’m not as familiar with. I don’t see anything that prohibits that. If the Kimmel School wants to add some additional requirements that are not technically part of the major I think I’m correct, they are program requirements that are separate from the major; separate from the current liberal studies; there’s nothing that prohibits them from doing that.

Comment: About 7-8 years ago, the term program requirements was in fact eliminated. If a program wants to add calculus or add physics to their major they add it to their major; it becomes honesty in packaging. So, you add what you want to it becomes part of the major. If you look back in the old catalogs, you’ll see there used to be a different section called program requirements. It’s not there anymore. I don’t know who eliminated; I don’t know if it’s a law, but I do know that it’s a matter of practice. There was a time, close to 10 years ago that there was (unclear) that we no longer allow program requirements. Stick them in your major.

Comment: I have a question since I wasn’t here last time. I don’t have a problem with the idea of a single general studies program. I think single is kind of implied by the word, university; it’s just one university. My question is about the underlined sentence in the beginning of the second paragraph. If people are entitled to submit these proposals what does it mean that the Senate opposes them in principle?

Comment: (Right, I thought that was kind of to say; you can throw pennies into the fountain….A lot of people talking over each other….parts of conversation included, “talking out of two sides of the mouth.” )

Comment: That’s where we ended up last time when we ran past 5:00 o’clock. It is kind of an odd issue there, but this is my effort to bridge that gap. The fact is the first paragraph is really the point, but people have a right to make nutty proposals, and there needs to be curriculum path formed and the problem we were facing, what triggered this is that Brian Railsback developed an Honors Path Curriculum for which no curriculum path existed. One needed to be created. I think that APRC and people working there did a great job of coming up with that and so the second paragraph is to say anybody else who wants to try that, this is the path you have to go through to do it.

Comment: I understand that and the path is pretty clear; it’s just I thought that sentence implied that we can write the answer to any proposal now if we oppose it in principle.

Comment: Well, I can.

Comment: Opposing something in principle doesn’t mean that you’re committing yourself to always voting against it. You’re simply saying as a matter of general principle this is what we think is better. If someone can come up with a viable proposal that makes sense given some special circumstances…

Comment: Shouldn’t that language be in there, if you’re going to use the other? That yes, we oppose it by principle, however, we acknowledge that there are viable alternatives.

Comment: Further comments, unclear.

Comment: That’s fine with me. Just strike the first sentence and leave the path. That’s the way it started out.

Comment: I wonder if the whole second paragraph really belongs in the resolution actually because it seems more of a general ideal and this second part seems almost bureaucratic, procedural.

Comment: Ok, I like that. What you are saying, x. Ok, the honors path, that’s been solved by a separate resolution of the Senate. What if Kimmel School came up with one? Does it already have a path established?

Comment: Didn’t we vote on that?

Comment: It was actually specific on that one. We treated it as a potential precedent setter…

Comment: It would seem to me whether it’s the will of the Senate to leave the first sentence of the second paragraph intact or not that the intent of the second paragraph is to establish that this is the procedure the one we’ve already approved for the Honors College by which any other proposals would be evaluated and eventually come to the Senate for action.

Comment: Would it work better without the first sentence?

Comment: It tends to set up; the way I came back to me and says, well, hell throw anything you want in; we’re going to kill it.

Comment: That was exactly what I’m after. (Laughter)

Comment: This is kind of a technical question. Do we have something called the general studies program or is it called liberal studies?

Comment: We changed it to Liberal Studies.

Comment: Do we have to then have a general studies program before we put it in a resolution?

Comment: I don’t think so, because I think the term is being used here in the generic sense. Whether we call it Liberal Studies or General Education or whatever what we’re talking about is the general sense that there is going to be some program single or otherwise within the university that is going to be a requirement for all students.

Comment: There’s no mechanism for the people submitting the proposed change to address the concerns of the people at the college and the college’s oversight committee and anything like that. Is there some reason that you don’t want to allow people to make the argument that what they’re doing is in the best interest of the student.

Comment: You lost me.

Comment: Well, Brian Railsback believes that his proposal is in the best interest of his students and we’re going to consult, well, ok the APRC, the UCC and the Oversight Committee are going to debate it; they’re going to consult with the colleges but there’s no mechanism for Brian to go to the colleges to make his case.

Comment: Sure, he can. He can go the curriculum committee. He can be on the agenda.

Comment: I was going to say too, aren’t his students also the university students? Doesn’t that sort of defeat the purpose to continually think of everybody’s students as individual property and not; I mean in the sense that this is a general studies program we’re talking about.

Comment: Was that addressing whether Brian should be allowed to…

Comment: With all the curriculum, all those meetings are open and anyone is allowed to come and may even be in particular, invited to defend their curriculum things. So that’s I would say, implicit in what we’ve done already and so, it’s true now and it has been. So, I’m thinking you’re just saying keep what we have as acceptable and keep going.

At this point the recording was lost due to technical difficulties.

Comment: Is there a person or statistic about the number of times people change majors –

Comment: 3 times is the average; same with careers. Speaking in favor of the core.

Comment: Agreed that the change of major is a compelling argument.

Comment: Want to say something about nursing – thinks they don’t get enough liberal studies; our prior degree students (different degree) are our best students & they go out to middle management too.

Comment: Our students come back, but believe it’s more a maturity issue than breadth of background.

Comment: Is the word “attitudes” still there – “Yes”

VOTE BY BALLOT:

Yes – 24

No – 4

Vote passes.

Liberal Studies/General Studies: Second Paragraph (with first sentence removed)

Resolved:

Comment: Seems a redundant motion – gave group mandate.

Comment: Wait to see how it goes with Honors College then see where it needs to be tweaked.

Comment: How vulnerable are we by not having?

Comment: Perhaps a moratorium on potential changes until Honors College goes through

Comment: Maybe this needs to be in terms of changing By-laws and sent to the Rules Committee.

Comment: Asked Fred Hinson if anything would happen with Liberal Studies. Without Senate; true; indicates Senate is just adj.

Other New Business:

Resolution from email:

* Requests a committee be formed
* Trying to provide a structure by which rational debate can be started
* Wouldn’t hurt to review

A motion was made and seconded.

Discussion:

Comment: Object to 3rd paragraph; we don’t need Chancellor to do this; we can do this.

Comment: Going back to meeting summer with Provost and Chancellor. Request: Suggestion that this motion be sent to APRC.

Comment: Agree with x, about putting us into control, not just advisory; just change Chancellor and his delegate to Faculty Senate. Wants to allow outside community to also have input.

Comment: Just wanted “buy-in” from Chancellor.

Comment: Go through deliberately and get feedback and do purposefully.

Comment: Meeting with Chancellor at start of year; why Chancellor put it on hold? Focus on QEP and evaluation of our graduates; he had a good motive.

Comment: Also mentioned “no child left behind” at college level.

Comment: Also a lot of data from assessment that hasn’t been interpreted that doesn’t need to be tabulara rosa, but also not a large amount of discontent.

Comment: More “editing” of current program where programs are having issues, try to ease up the pressure; in favor of most of x’s resolution and letting it go to APRC.

Comment: Sensing a consensus, take a look at APRC looking at this; his work with Provost.

Comment: Can we do this this semester? Do we have a meeting in December (3rd) ; we can bring things back for discussion.

Comment: Ask we include in library?

Other New Business:

Comment: Secret ballot viewed by some as against openness, or members of Senate.

Some colleagues feel we’re aggregating our responsibility; talk with others about this.

Comment: Can you tell us who wanted this?

Comment: Take advantage-all meetings of Board of Trustees are open including committee meetings.

Talked with Chancellor about changing organization of meeting so reports can be moved up; questions could be made prior to Board taking action.

Comment: Would like a report to come back to us from these meetings too, would be useful to have Senate Committee members join/attend meetings and report back.

Motion to Adjourn at 4:50 p.m.